

MIAMI BEACH

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Staff Report & Recommendation

Historic Preservation Board

TO: Chairperson and Members
Historic Preservation Board

DATE: March 8, 2016

FROM: Thomas R. Mooney, AICP
Planning Director



SUBJECT: File No. 7620, **555 Washington Avenue.**

The applicant, EOSII AT 555 Washington LLC., is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for removal of the existing mosaic tile to be replacement with a new façade treatment on the existing Non-Contributing building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness with conditions.

EXISTING STRUCTURE

Local Historic District:	Ocean Beach
Status:	Non-Contributing
Original Construction Date:	2001
Original Architect:	Arquitectonica

BACKGROUND

On July 13, 1999, the Joint Design Review/Historic Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review Approval (DRB File No. 10717J) for the construction of a 5-story mixed-use office/retail structure.

ZONING / SITE DATA

Legal Description:	Lots 7 thru 12 less part for St, Block 3 of the Friedman & Copes Subdivision, according to the plat thereof recorded in Plat Book 4, Page 83 of the public records of Miami Dade County, Florida.
--------------------	---

Zoning:	CPS-2, Commercial performance standard, general mixed use
Future Land Use Designation:	CPS-2, Commercial performance standard, general mixed use

THE PROJECT

The applicant has submitted plans entitled "555 Washington Ave. – Design Revisions" as prepared by Stantec, dated January 29, 2016.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for removal of the existing mosaic tile to be replacement with a new façade treatment on the existing Non-Contributing building.

CONSISTENCY WITH 2025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

A preliminary review of the project indicates that the proposed **commercial use** appears to be **consistent** with the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING CODE

The application as proposed appears to be consistent with the requirements of the City Code; this shall not be considered final zoning review or approval.

All zoning matters shall require final review and verification by the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

COMPLIANCE WITH CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS CRITERIA

A decision on an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be based upon the following:

- I. Evaluation of the compatibility of the physical alteration or improvement with surrounding properties and where applicable, compliance with the following criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(1) of the Miami Beach Code (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):
 - a. The Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings as revised from time to time.
Satisfied
 - b. Other guidelines/policies/plans adopted or approved by Resolution or Ordinance by the City Commission.
Satisfied
- II. In determining whether a particular application is compatible with surrounding properties, the Board shall consider the following criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(2) of the Miami Beach Code (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):
 - a. Exterior architectural features.
Satisfied
 - b. General design, scale, massing and arrangement.
Satisfied
 - c. Texture and material and color.
Not Satisfied
Physical material samples have not been submitted.
 - d. The relationship of a, b, c, above, to other structures and features of the district.
Satisfied
 - e. The purpose for which the district was created.

Satisfied

- f. The relationship of the size, design and siting of any new or reconstructed structure to the landscape of the district.

Not Applicable

- g. An historic resources report, containing all available data and historic documentation regarding the building, site or feature.

Not Applicable

- h. The original architectural design or any subsequent modifications that have acquired significance.

Not Applicable

- III. The examination of architectural drawings for consistency with the criteria pursuant to Section 118-564(a)(3) of the Miami Beach Code and stated below, with regard to the aesthetics, appearances, safety, and function of any new or existing structure, public interior space and physical attributes of the project in relation to the site, adjacent structures and properties, and surrounding community. The criteria referenced above are as follows (it is recommended that the listed criteria be found Satisfied, Not Satisfied or Not Applicable, as so noted):

- a. The location of all existing and proposed buildings, drives, parking spaces, walkways, means of ingress and egress, drainage facilities, utility services, landscaping structures, signs, and lighting and screening devices.

Not Applicable

- b. The dimensions of all buildings, structures, setbacks, parking spaces, floor area ratio, height, lot coverage and any other information that may be reasonably necessary to determine compliance with the requirements of the underlying zoning district, and any applicable overlays, for a particular application or project.

Not Applicable

- c. The color, design, surface finishes and selection of landscape materials and architectural elements of the exterior of all buildings and structures and primary public interior areas for developments requiring a building permit in areas of the city identified in section 118-503.

Not Satisfied

Physical material samples have not been submitted.

- d. The proposed structure, and/or additions to an existing structure is appropriate to and compatible with the environment and adjacent structures, and enhances the appearance of the surrounding properties, or the purposes for which the district was created.

Satisfied

- e. The design and layout of the proposed site plan, as well as all new and existing buildings and public interior spaces shall be reviewed so as to provide an efficient arrangement of land uses. Particular attention shall be given to safety, crime prevention and fire protection, relationship to the surrounding

neighborhood, impact on preserving historic character of the neighborhood and district, contiguous and adjacent buildings and lands, pedestrian sight lines and view corridors.

Not Applicable

- f. Pedestrian and vehicular traffic movement within and adjacent to the site shall be reviewed to ensure that clearly defined, segregated pedestrian access to the site and all buildings is provided for and that any driveways and parking spaces are usable, safely and conveniently arranged and have a minimal impact on pedestrian circulation throughout the site. Access to the site from adjacent roads shall be designed so as to interfere as little as possible with vehicular traffic flow on these roads and pedestrian movement onto and within the site, as well as permit both pedestrians and vehicles a safe ingress and egress to the site.

Not Applicable

- g. Lighting shall be reviewed to ensure safe movement of persons and vehicles and reflection on public property for security purposes and to minimize glare and reflection on adjacent properties and consistent with a City master plan, where applicable.

Not Applicable

- h. Landscape and paving materials shall be reviewed to ensure an adequate relationship with and enhancement of the overall site plan design.

Not Applicable

- i. Buffering materials shall be reviewed to ensure that headlights of vehicles, noise, and light from Structures are adequately shielded from public view, adjacent properties and pedestrian areas.

Not Applicable

- j. Any proposed new structure shall have an orientation and massing which is sensitive to and compatible with the building site and surrounding area and which creates or maintains important view corridor(s).

Not Applicable

- k. All buildings shall have, to the greatest extent possible, space in that part of the ground floor fronting a sidewalk, street or streets which is to be occupied for residential or commercial uses; likewise, the upper floors of the pedestal portion of the proposed building fronting a sidewalk street, or streets shall have residential or commercial spaces, or shall have the appearance of being a residential or commercial space or shall have an architectural treatment which shall buffer the appearance of a parking structure from the surrounding area and is integrated with the overall appearance of the project.

Not Applicable

- l. All buildings shall have an appropriate and fully integrated rooftop architectural treatment which substantially screens all mechanical equipment, stairs and elevator towers.

Not Applicable

- m. Any addition on a building site shall be designed, sited and massed in a manner which is sensitive to and compatible with the existing improvement(s).
Not Applicable
- n. All portions of a project fronting a street or sidewalk shall incorporate an amount of transparency at the first level necessary to achieve pedestrian compatibility.
Not Applicable
- o. The location, design, screening and buffering of all required service bays, delivery bays, trash and refuse receptacles, as well as trash rooms shall be arranged so as to have a minimal impact on adjacent properties.
Not Applicable

STAFF ANALYSIS

On July 13, 1999, the Joint Design Review/Historic Preservation Board approved a Certificate of Appropriateness and Design Review Approval (DRB File No. 10717J) for the construction of a 5-story mixed-use office/retail structure. As part of the original design, certain architectural elements were clad with a blue mosaic tile. Over the course of time, water infiltration behind the tile has caused some of the tiles to become delaminated and fall off of the building. Due to ongoing maintenance issues, the applicant is proposing the removal of the existing tile and the introduction of a new façade treatment. The proposed façade design incorporates angled score lines and aluminum channel reveals resulting in a dynamic stucco finish pattern. Additionally, the applicant has selected a new paint color pallet that will emphasize the new design. Staff is supportive of the new façade concept the architect has developed for the structure which establishes a successful relationship with the existing architectural forms of the building.

RECOMMENDATION

In view of the foregoing analysis, staff recommends the application be **approved** subject to the conditions enumerated in the attached draft Order, which address the inconsistencies with the aforementioned Certificate of Appropriateness criteria.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
City of Miami Beach, Florida

MEETING DATE: March 8, 2016

FILE NO: 7620

PROPERTY: 555 Washington Avenue

APPLICANT: EOSII AT 555 Washington LLC.

LEGAL: Lots 7 thru 12 less part for St, Block 3 of the Friedman & Copes Subdivision, according to the plat thereof recorded in Plat Book 4, Page 83 of the public records of Miami Dade County, Florida.

IN RE: The Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for removal of the existing mosaic tile to be replacement with a new façade treatment on the existing Non-Contributing building.

ORDER

The City of Miami Beach Historic Preservation Board makes the following FINDINGS OF FACT, based upon the evidence, information, testimony and materials presented at the public hearing and which are part of the record for this matter:

I. Certificate of Appropriateness

- A. The subject site is located within the Ocean Beach Local Historic District.
- B. Based on the plans and documents submitted with the application, testimony and information provided by the applicant, and the reasons set forth in the Planning Department Staff Report, the project as submitted:
 - 1. Is consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria in Section 118-564(a)(1) of the Miami Beach Code.
 - 2. Is not consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria 'c' in Section 118-564(a)(2) of the Miami Beach Code.
 - 3. Is not consistent with Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria 'c' in Section 118-564(a)(3) of the Miami Beach Code.

C. The project would be consistent with the criteria and requirements of section 118-564 if the following conditions are met:

1. Revised elevation, site plan and floor plan drawings shall be submitted and, at a minimum, such drawings shall incorporate the following:

a. Final details of all exterior surface finishes and materials, including samples, shall be submitted, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.

In accordance with Section 118-537, the applicant, the owner(s) of the subject property, the City Manager, Miami Design Preservation League, Dade Heritage Trust, or an affected person may appeal the Board's decision on a Certificate of Appropriateness to a special master appointed by the City Commission.

II. Variance(s)

A. No variances have been requested as a part of this application.

III. General Terms and Conditions applying to both 'I. Certificate of Appropriateness' and 'II. Variances' noted above.

A. A Construction Parking and Traffic Management Plan (CPTMP) shall be approved by the Parking Director pursuant to Chapter 106, Article II, Division 3 of the City Code, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

B. Where one or more parcels are unified for a single development, the property owner shall execute and record a unity of title or a covenant in lieu of unity of title, as may be applicable, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney.

C. A copy of all pages of the recorded Final Order shall be scanned into the plans submitted for building permit, and shall be located immediately after the front cover page of the permit plans.

D. The Final Order shall be recorded in the Public Records of Miami-Dade County, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

E. All applicable FPL transformers or vault rooms and backflow prevention devices shall be located within the building envelope with the exception of the valve (PIV) which may be visible and accessible from the street.

F. Applicant agrees that in the event Code Compliance receives complaints of unreasonably loud noise from mechanical and/or electrical equipment, and determines the complaints to be valid, even if the equipment is operating pursuant to manufacturer specifications, the applicant shall take such steps to mitigate the noise with noise attenuating materials as reviewed and verified by an acoustic engineer, in a manner to be reviewed and approved by staff consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness Criteria and/or the directions from the Board.

- G. Satisfaction of all conditions is required for the Planning Department to give its approval on a Certificate of Occupancy; a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy or Partial Certificate of Occupancy may also be conditionally granted Planning Departmental approval.
- H. The Final Order is not severable, and if any provision or condition hereof is held void or unconstitutional in a final decision by a court of competent jurisdiction, the order shall be returned to the Board for reconsideration as to whether the order meets the criteria for approval absent the stricken provision or condition, and/or it is appropriate to modify the remaining conditions or impose new conditions.
- I. The conditions of approval herein are binding on the applicant, the property's owners, operators, and all successors in interest and assigns.
- J. Nothing in this order authorizes a violation of the City Code or other applicable law, nor allows a relaxation of any requirement or standard set forth in the City Code

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, based upon the foregoing findings of fact, the evidence, information, testimony and materials presented at the public hearing, which are part of the record for this matter, and the staff report and analysis, which are adopted herein, including the staff recommendations, which were amended and adopted by the Board, that the application is GRANTED for the above-referenced project subject to those certain conditions specified in Paragraph I, II, III of the Findings of Fact, to which the applicant has agreed.

PROVIDED, the applicant shall build substantially in accordance with the plans entitled "555 Washington Ave. – Design Revisions" as prepared by Stantec, dated January 29, 2016, and as approved by the Historic Preservation Board, as determined by staff.

When requesting a building permit, the plans submitted to the Building Department for permit shall be consistent with the plans approved by the Board, modified in accordance with the conditions set forth in this Order. No building permit may be issued unless and until all conditions of approval that must be satisfied prior to permit issuance, as set forth in this Order, have been met.

The issuance of the approval does not relieve the applicant from obtaining all other required Municipal, County and/or State reviews and permits, including final zoning approval. If adequate handicapped access is not provided on the Board-approved plans, this approval does not mean that such handicapped access is not required. When requesting a building permit, the plans submitted to the Building Department for permit shall be consistent with the plans approved by the Board, modified in accordance with the conditions set forth in this Order.

If the Full Building Permit for the project is not issued within eighteen (18) months of the meeting date at which the original approval was granted, the application will expire and become null and void, unless the applicant makes an application to the Board for an extension of time, in accordance with the requirements and procedures of Chapter 118 of the City Code; the granting of any such extension of time shall be at the discretion of the Board. If the Full Building Permit for the project should expire for any reason (including but not limited to construction not commencing and continuing, with required inspections, in accordance with the applicable Building Code), the application will expire and become null and void.

In accordance with Chapter 118 of the City Code, the violation of any conditions and safeguards that are a part of this Order shall be deemed a violation of the land development regulations of the City Code. Failure to comply with this **Order** shall subject the application to Chapter 118 of the City Code, for revocation or modification of the application.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 20____.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
THE CITY OF MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA

BY: _____
DEBORAH TACKETT
PRESERVATION AND DESIGN MANAGER
FOR THE CHAIR

[illegible]

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____, 20____ by Deborah Tackett, Preservation and Design Manager, Planning Department, City of Miami Beach, Florida, a Florida Municipal Corporation, on behalf of the corporation. He is personally known to me.

NOTARY PUBLIC
Miami-Dade County, Florida
My commission expires: _____

Approved As To Form: _____
City Attorney's Office: _____ ()

Filed with the Clerk of the Historic Preservation Board on _____ ()